

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,328	03/01/2004	James T. Amburgey	2003-0688.01	8995
	7590 10/29/200 ITERNATIONAL, INC	EXAMINER		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPARTMENT 740 WEST NEW CIRCLE ROAD BLDG. 082-1			DISTEFANO, GREGORY A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LEXINGTON,	KY 40550-0999	2176		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/790,328	AMBURGEY ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Gregory A. DiStefano	2176		

	Gregory A. DiStefano	2176	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 15 October 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No. (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complete following time periods: 	n the same day as filing a Notice o wing replies: (1) an amendment, af otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	f Appeal. To avoid ab fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which CFR 41.31; or
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07	r than SIX MONTHS from the mailing of (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	late of the final rejection	•
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date peen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most parent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. and the corresponding amount of the fi statutory period for reply originally set	ee. The appropriate extended in the final Office action	ension fee under 3 ;ass(Se)t forth in (b)
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any explored a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be appeared to the North Composition of the North Composition o	ktension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))	, to avoid dismissal o	f the appeal.
AMENDMENTS	h A		h
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			the issues for .
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))	-	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.65. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL -324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).		, timely filed amendm	ent canceling
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro		vill be entered and an	explanation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	·		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	eal and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the control of the contr			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered be <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	ut does NOT place the application i	in condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
	•	/Doug Hutton/ Supervisory Patent Exa	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues on pgs. 4 and 5 of their reply filed on 10/15/2007, that neither the Boyce reference nor the Kikinis reference teaches or suggests "a plurality of multifunctional printers coupled to [a] central computer," as recited in claim 1.

The examiner respectfully disagrees.

As previously presented in the Final Rejection filed on 8/13/2007, Windows (Boyce) teaches that roaming user profiles may be stored on a network server for the purpose of a user being able to log on to a client computer and copying their profile to the current logon location (pg. 9). This teaching of Windows suggests a network of a plurality of computers that are coupled to a central computer (server), but fails to teach that the plurality of computers are "multifunctional printers".

As previously presented in the Final Rejection filed on 8/13/2007, Kikinis teaches of a "multifunctional printer", in a system of an integrated computer, scanner, and printer (abstract).

Motivation for comb ining the "multifunctional printer" of Kiknis into the network of Windows may be found in Kikinis's suggestion that their "multifunctional printer" may be connected to a network in their teaching of their device utilizing a network adapter (column 8, lines 29-33). Furthermore, Kikines suggests a need for their "multifunctional printer" to possess an operating system in column 2, lines 34 -36, and Windows was well known in the art to be such an operating system. Therefore, upon combination of the network of computers connected to a central server of Windows and the computers being a plurality of "multifunctional printers" of Kikinis, one would come to "a network of multifunctional printers connected to a central server" which clearly encompasses applicant's limitation in claim 1 of "a plurality of multifuncational printers coupled to [a] central computer.